



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

Steven M. Senn  
18336 Aurora Ave N  
Suite 112-421  
Shoreline WA 98133

**COPY MAILED**

**AUG 07 2008**

In re Application of :  
Steven M. Senn :  
Application No. 09/888,554 : **DECISION ON PETITION**  
Filed: June 26, 2001 :  
Title: Retail Customer and :  
Product Purchase Divider with :  
Interactive Retail Transaction  
Functions

This is a decision on the petition under the unintentional provisions of 37 CFR 1.137(b), filed June 18, 2008, to revive the above-identified application.

The petition is **DISMISSED**.

Any request for reconsideration of this decision must be submitted within TWO (2) MONTHS from the mail date of this decision. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are permitted. The reconsideration request should include a cover letter entitled "Renewed Petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b)." This is **not** a final agency action within the meaning of 5 U.S.C. § 704.

This above-identified application became abandoned for failure to timely file a reply to a non-final Office Action mailed October 3, 2003. The non-final Office Action set a three (3) month shortened statutory period for reply. No extensions of time were obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). Accordingly, this application became abandoned on January 4, 2004. A Notice of Abandonment was mailed on May 5, 2004.

Petitioner states that he did not receive the October 3, 2003 non-final Office action and the Notice of Abandonment because he no longer received mail at the correspondence address of record. Petitioner states he unintentionally failed to submit a change of address with the Office.

A grantable petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b) must be accompanied by: (1) the required reply, unless previously filed; (2) the

Application No. 09/888,554

petition fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(m); (3) a statement that the entire delay in filing the required reply from the due date for the reply until the filing of a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) was unintentional; and (4) any terminal disclaimer (and fee as set forth in 37 CFR 1.20(d)) required by 37 CFR 1.137(d). Where there is a question as to whether either the abandonment or the delay in filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.137 was unintentional, the Director may require additional information. See MPEP 711.03(c)(II)(C) and (D). The instant petition lacks item (1) and (3).

As to item (1) petitioner has failed to provide a reply to the non-final Office action. A courtesy copy of the October 3, 2003 Office action is being included for petitioner's convenience.

As to item (3), there are three periods to be considered during the evaluation of a petition under 37 CFR 1.137(b):

(1) the delay in reply that originally resulted in the abandonment;

(2) the delay in filing an initial petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive the application; and

(3) the delay in filing a grantable petition pursuant to 37 CFR 1.137(b) to revive the application.

Currently, the delay has not been shown to the satisfaction of the Director to be unintentional for period (2).

Where the applicant deliberately chooses not to seek or persist in seeking the revival of an abandoned application, or where the applicant deliberately chooses to delay seeking the revival of an abandoned application, the resulting delay in seeking revival of the abandoned application cannot be considered as "unintentional" within the meaning of 37 CFR 1.137(b). See MPEP 711.03(c).

The language of both 35 U.S.C. § 41(a)(7) and 37 CFR 1.137(b) are clear and unambiguous, and, furthermore, without qualification. That is, the delay in filing the reply during prosecution, as well as in filing the petition seeking revival, must have been, without qualification, "unintentional" for the reply to now be accepted on petition. The Office requires that the entire delay be at least unintentional as a prerequisite to revival of an abandoned application to prevent abuse and injury to the public. See H.R. Rep. No. 542, 97th Cong., 2d Sess. 7 (1982), reprinted in 1982 U.S.C.C.A.N. 771 ("[i]n order to prevent abuse and injury to the public the Commissioner . . . could require applicants to

act promptly after becoming aware of the abandonment"). The December 1997 change to 37 CFR 1.137 did not create any new right to overcome an intentional delay in seeking revival, or in renewing an attempt at seeking revival, of an abandoned application. See Changes to Patent Practice and Procedure; Final Rule Notice, 62 Fed. Reg. 53131, 53160 (October 10, 1997), 1203 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office 63, 87 (October 21, 1997), which clearly stated that any protracted delay (here, over four years) could trigger, as here, a request for additional information. As the courts have since made clear, a protracted delay in seeking revival, as here, requires a petitioner's detailed explanation seeking to excuse the delay as opposed to USPTO acceptance of a general allegation of unintentional delay. See Lawman Armor v. Simon, 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 10843, 74 USPQ2d 1633, at 1637-8 (DC EMich 2005); Field Hybrids, LLC v. Toyota Motor Corp., 2005 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 1159 (D. Minn Jan. 27, 2005) at \*21-\*23. Statements are required from any and all persons having firsthand knowledge of the circumstances surrounding the protracted delay, after the abandonment date, in seeking revival.

Any renewed petition may be addressed as follows:

By Mail:            Mail Stop PETITION  
                      Commissioner for Patents  
                      P. O. Box 1450  
                      Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

By hand:            U. S. Patent and Trademark Office  
                      Customer Service Window, Mail Stop Petitions  
                      Randolph Building  
                      401 Dulany Street  
                      Alexandria, VA 22314

The centralized facsimile number is (571) 273-8300.

Correspondence regarding this decision may also be filed through the electronic filing system of the USPTO.

Telephone inquiries concerning this decision should be directed to the undersigned at (571) 272-3215.



Charlema Grant  
Petitions Attorney  
Office of Petitions

enclosure